

REMARKS

I. Formal Matters. Subsequent to entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 24, 25, 28-33 and 36-46 are currently pending in this application. New claims 40-46 are presently submitted via this Amendment, and claims 26, 27, 34 and 35 are cancelled without prejudice and/or disclaimer via this Amendment.

II. Claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter in claims 30 and 38.

Claims 24, 25, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over *Kennan* (U.S. Patent No. 5,649,312). *Kennan* discloses a mixer that produces sum and difference frequency signals. However, neither in the text cited by the Examiner, nor in the text at large, does *Kennan* disclose an active inductive load.

In contrast, Applicant claims a mixer comprising an active inductive load via this Amendment. A proper claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) teaches or suggests each and every element of the subject claim. At least for failing to teach or suggest the element of a mixer comprising an active inductive load, Applicant asserts that the alleged obviousness rejection of claims 24, 25, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Kennan* is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by *Harris, Jr., et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,829,204) ("*Harris*"). *Harris* discloses a mixer circuit comprising a variable impedance load, where said load comprises an FET. Neither in the text cited by the Examiner, nor in the patent at large, does *Harris* disclose a mixer comprising an active inductive load.

In contrast, Applicant claims a mixer comprising an active inductive load via this Amendment. A proper claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) discloses each and every element of the subject claim. At least for failing to disclose the element of a mixer comprising an active inductive load, Applicant asserts that the alleged anticipation of claims 32 and 33 by *Harris* under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Broderick* (U.S. Patent No. 5,170,500) in view of *Tanji* (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,352) and *Kennan*. Neither *Broderick*, *Tanji* or *Kennan*, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a mixer comprising an active inductive load.

In contrast, Applicant claims a mixer comprising an active inductive load via this Amendment. A proper claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) teaches or suggests each and every element of the subject claim. At least for failing to teach or suggest the element of a mixer comprising an active inductive load, Applicant asserts that the alleged obviousness rejection of claims 28 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Broderick* in view of *Tanji* and *Kennan* is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 29, 31, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Broderick* in view of *Tanji* and *Kennan* and further in view of *Yamaguchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,695) ("*Yamaguchi*"). The Examiner relies on *Yamaguchi* to provide the element of a limiter comprising an active load (OA page 6). However, *Yamaguchi* fails to teach or suggest a limiter comprising an active inductive load.

In contrast, Applicant claims a transceiver comprising a limiter comprising an active inductive load via this Amendment. A proper claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) teaches or suggests each and every element of the subject claim. *Broderick*, *Tanji*, *Kennan* and *Yamaguchi*, neither individually nor in combination, teach or suggest the element of a limiter comprising an inductive load. At least for failing to teach or suggest the element of a mixer comprising an active inductive load, Applicant asserts that the alleged obviousness rejection of claims 29, 31, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Broderick* in view of *Tanji* and *Kennan* and further in view of *Yamaguchi* is improper and should be withdrawn.

At least for depending from an allowable independent claim, claims 30 and 38 are hereby asserted as being in condition for allowance.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/816,346

ART UNIT 2685
A7831

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed on the following page.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,049

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 27, 2005